

Performance Evaluation of MCC's Green Prosperity Facility in Indonesia

Transparency Statement

The evaluation team collected two sets of data – qualitative and quantitative – for this evaluation. The team then proceeded to analyze both datasets to generate and triangulate findings to answer the five evaluation questions for this project.

Quantitative: Online Survey of Green Prosperity Applicants and Grantees (Restricted Use)

The online survey was used to gather perceptions of the proposal and implementation phases of the Green Prosperity project, from the perspective of grantees as well as from individuals who had applied for, but ultimately did not receive, a grant.

The responses to the online survey have been included in the Excel document. The quantitative responses are in their original format, and were analyzed using Survey Gizmo's analytical tools. The "test" responses have been removed from the dataset, and respondent numbers have been randomly assigned to mitigate risk of re-identification, should someone gain access to the original dataset.

Open-ended responses to the survey have been removed to protect respondent identities, as the qualitative responses contained direct or indirect identifiers. The findings from the qualitative responses have been summarized in the report and verified by KIIs.

All quantitative data can be fully replicated using the anonymized dataset submitted with this data package.

Qualitative: Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions (Not submitted)

The evaluation team collected qualitative data from MCC, MCA-I, grantees, and Project Management Consultants associated with GP through Key Informant Interviews and Focus Group Discussions. Upon submission of the design report, the evaluation team (with IRB support) advised against submitting qualitative data for public or restricted use, and received PM concurrence with this decision.

The purpose of the KIIs is different than, for example, qualitative research done using a series of focus groups with a single guide or questionnaire repeated among a large group of beneficiaries meant to capture representative perspectives of a broader group. In this evaluation, only a limited number of individuals can be expected to comment substantively on a specific topic or on specific evaluation questions. As such, interview guides necessarily differed by respondent. This limits the team's ability to protect anonymity of respondents due to the low number of respondents per respondent group. Similarly, anonymizing qualitative transcripts would likely require the team to remove a large portion of portfolio-specific and historical information in order to truly protect the respondent's anonymity. That would limit the utility of that data for MCC or other stakeholders. As such, we do not expect that there is a strong case for secondary analyses that could be done using such interview data.